

**STATE BOARD ADVISORY PANEL
FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION**

The Arizona State Advisory Panel for Special Education held a meeting at the Arizona Dept. of Education, 1535 W. Jefferson, Room 417, Phoenix, Arizona, on May 18, 2010, from 9:30 am – 3:30 pm.

Members Present

Ronald L. Clanton
Susan Douglas
Ileen G. Herberg
Robert Hill, Ed.S.
Alecia Jackson
Gail Jacobs, Ed.D.
Dr. Ida Malian
Kathy McDonald
Kimberly A. Peaslee
Terisa Rademacher, Co-chair
Kay B. Turner, Ed.D, Vice-chairperson
Char Ugol
Nancy K. Williams, Co-Chair

Others Present

Valerie Andrews James, ADE/ECSE
Cyndi Bolewski, ADE/ESS
Diane Mignella, ADE/ESS
Roberta Brown, ADE/ESS
Jeannette Zemeida, ADE/ESS

Members Absent

Molly Bright
M. Diane Bruening
D.J. Carpenter
Sam Carpenter
Dr. Barbara Ganz
Dave Graham
Kim Simmons

Minutes Approved (As Read)(As Amended)

Chairperson: _____

Signature

Date

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
1. Call to order.	Nancy Williams, Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m.	1. None.
2. Approval of March 2, 2010 minutes	<p>As members were unable to review the minutes prior to the May meeting, Terisa Rademacher made a motion which was seconded by Robert Hill to table approval of the minutes of the March 2, 2010 meetings until the June 18, 2010 meeting.</p> <p>The motion was approved.</p>	2. Tabled.
3. Public comment.	Ms. Williams welcomed the public in attendance. She explained to those present the procedures for making a comment. Anyone wishing to comment on an agenda item was asked to fill out a brief questionnaire stating which agenda item they wished to comment on. That person would then be called on when that item was discussed.	3. None.
4. Exceptional Student Services.	<p>Diane Mignella, Program Support Director, Arizona Dept. of Education (ADE), Exceptional Student Services (ESS), provided the Panel with a copy of the March 2010 Monitoring Alert which had been e-mailed to Special Education Directors in Arizona. The Alert gave special education directors information on areas of emphasis for the upcoming monitoring year.</p> <p>One specific item that will have an increased emphasis in 2010-2011 will be measurable annual goals. Arizona PEAs are approx. 60% compliant every year. There seems to be struggles with aligning goals to the standards. ESS staff frequently sees the standard, which is too broad, being used as a student's goal.</p> <p>In order to give PEAs a better idea on how to set measurable goals ESS will be giving regional trainings in October and November 2010 in 7 different locations statewide. There will be follow-up trainings in the same locations in March or April 2011.</p> <p>This area is going to be a 60-day corrective action monitoring item in the 2010-2011 school year.</p> <p>There are 8 line items for Indicator 13 (High School Transition). Each one of these items must meet 100% compliance when monitoring. These are also 60-day corrective action items.</p> <p>There were 104 monitorings conducted this past school year.</p> <p>There will be 109 monitorings for the upcoming school year. Fifteen will be data review; up from 4 this past school year. These schools have met and/or exceeded PEA determinations. Sixty-four schools will do a self-assessment; 30 will be monitored on-site by ESS staff – 6 were moved in to year 4 due to systemic issues.</p>	4. None.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	<p>Ms. Mignella fielded questions from the Panel.</p> <p>Roberta Brown, Director of State and Federal Initiatives, ADE/ESS, reported to the Panel on the Federal Fiscal Year 2008 (FFY 08) PEA Determination Summary.</p> <p>Determinations were made for 569 PEAs. This is up about 20 from last year. Next year there will be about 600. There are 9 components that make up the determination. These include: valid and timely data, clear audit findings and secondary transition.</p> <p>Determination Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Meets requirements (greater than 90%): 459Needs assistance (50-90%): 73Needs intervention (20-49%): 2Needs substantial intervention (< 20%): 0 <p>PEAs requiring a “special monitor” were dropped one level. This happened to 4 PEAs this year. This caused 2 of them to drop into the “needs intervention” category.</p> <p>There has been a substantial increase in the number of PEAs that meet requirements in the past 4 years. Part of this was due to the changes in the rubric.</p> <p>Ms. Brown fielded questions from the Panel.</p> <p>Cynthia Bolewski, Director, ADE/ESS updated the Panel on clarifications and corrections to FFY 2008 Annual Performance Report (APR). Panel members received a copy of the revised APR, which included the corrections. Revisions and corrections to the APR (which was originally submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on January 29, 2010) were submitted on April 8, 2010.</p> <p>Ms. Bolewski reviewed the corrections made to Indicator 5: School Age Least Restrictive Environment due to a typographical error.</p> <p>Ms. Bolewski reviewed the corrections made to Indicator 15: Effective General Supervision. There were 2 clarifications added to the Indicator based on questions from OSEP staff.</p> <p>OSEP has informed state agencies that they should receive their final letter and determination in June. The letters and determinations will be published on the OSEP website for the public.</p> <p>FFY 2008 APR Indicator 2 (Dropout Rate) was reported as higher than it has been in previous</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	<p>years. ADE used the same data as used in school year 2007-08; however for the FFY 2008 report they used a different measurement and definition -- the same one as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), Part 1, which is aligned with the reporting for Title I under the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA). In past APRs, the measurement allowed ESS to report dropout rates aligned with the State definition as used for AZ LEARNS. The State definition of dropout is more liberal than the federal definition.</p> <p>The State definition uses grades 7-12, while the federal definition only uses grades 9-12. Ms. Bolewski also explained the other points to the state and federal definitions.</p> <p>Ms. Bolewski answered Panel questions regarding incarcerated students.</p> <p>Using the federal definition for dropout, the results for Indicator 2 were reported at 7.5% and did not meet the target of $\leq 5.3\%$. Under the old measurement the results were 3.6%. The dropout rate for all students was reported at 6.9%.</p> <p>Ms. Bolewski provided the Panel with an update on FFY 2009 APR Indicator 4a and 4b (Rates of Suspension and Expulsion). This data will be used in the APR which is due February 1, 2011. The data for this Indicator has been collected. Indicator 4B is a 0% compliance indicator.</p> <p>Three PEA s have been flagged for significant discrepancy for Indicator 4. They are currently reviewing their Policies, Procedures and Practices (PP&P). It appears that 2 PEAs have reported their data inaccurately.</p> <p>Dr. Gail Jacobs reported that Secure Care facilities are now required by OSEP to report data for Indicators 4A and 4B. She expressed her concerns that this may skew Arizona's data for this Indicator. Panel discussed this concern.</p> <p>Robert Hill made a motion that "SEAP form a task force to look into the Indicator 4 reporting requirements of detained and incarcerated special education students in Arizona and report back to SEAP at a future meeting, requesting that Dr. Gail Jacobs serve as chairperson." It was seconded by Dr. Kay Turner. Panel discussion followed. Motion carried unanimously.</p>	
5. Task Force on Best Practices in Special Education and Behavior Management	<p>Jean Ajamie, Education Director, Arizona Dept. of Education, School Safety and Prevention (SS&P) updated the Panel on AZ Safe reporting.</p> <p>AZ Safe (Arizona Safety Accountability for Education) is a new process by which schools collect and report discipline and safety incident data to the Dept. of Education. A major emphasis of the project is to get the data in a user-friendly format for schools so that they can</p>	5. None.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	<p>use it for secondary purposes to improve programming.</p> <p>Ms. Ajamie talked about the checklist that Jim Deaton, Director of Policy Services, Arizona School Boards Association (ASBA) provided to the Panel at the May SEAP meeting. The first item on the checklist refers to Behavior Management and Discipline of Special Needs Students. The second item refers to Recommendations of Implementing Positive Behavior Supports Schoolwide; and the third recommendation refers to Data-Driven Decisions.</p> <p>AZ Safe was designed to support PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports). It does supply the primary data that is used in PBIS.</p> <p>While it would be appropriate for school staff to use AZ Safe for looking at seclusion and restraint data they are not currently trained to use this data for this purpose.</p> <p>SS&P is looking at modifying AZ Safe so that schools use it for reporting incidents involving seclusion and restraint. While SS&P would need permission to mandate schools to input this information, schools can voluntarily use the program for this so that they can use the information in-house. SS&P would need extra funding in order to implement this change.</p> <p>Positive Behavioral Support in schools has been funded by the state through Special Education for the past 11 years. Unfortunately, that funding has ended. This was the primary support for PBIS. The majority of funding for this project has also ended.</p> <p>SS&P is looking at a possible fee-for-service model in terms of training and support.</p> <p>Ms. Ajamie fielded questions from the Panel.</p>	
6 Adjournment.	<p>The Panel broke for lunch at 12:00 noon.</p> <p>The Panel reconvened at 12:30 pm. A member unexpectedly did not return from lunch, and after the Panel waited for 30 minutes, Ms. Rademacher adjourned the meeting at 1:00 pm due to loss of quorum</p> <p>The next SEAP meeting will be scheduled for June 15, 2010.</p>	6. Adjournment.